

## REMARKS

Claims 1-11, 21-26, and 44 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. patent no. 4,611,236 ("Sato") in view of U.S. patent no. 5,780,883 ("Tran") and U.S. patent no. 6,285,216 ("Faue"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection because the cited references do not disclose or suggest every limitation of any pending claim, as the following analysis shows.

Independent claims 1 and 21 recite that the smaller transistors are used to form internal clock buffers. Contrary to the statements in the rejection, Sato does not disclose or suggest this limitation. Sato never mentions clocks, either internal or otherwise, in any context. Sato only mentions buffers in general, and teaches away from the claimed limitations by stating that higher capacity (i.e., larger) transistors are to be used for buffers (col. 3 line 26). On page 2 of the Office action, the rejection states that Sato "discloses in figure 8 that the transistors can be used to form the internal clock buffer; it is well known that the internal clock buffer comprises two inverters." In fact, figure 8 only discloses a series of inverters, but never describes what the inverters might be used for.

It requires impermissible hindsight to make an unsubstantiated statement of what might be well known and use that as proof of obviousness. Section 2143 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure ("MPEP") sets forth the requirements that must be satisfied to establish a prima facie case of obviousness under 35 USC 103. Section 2143 requires the cited references to contain a suggestion or motivation to combine them. The rejection fails to make this showing because it does not point out a suggestion or motivation to combine from within the references. Instead, it only makes a conclusory statement of what is well known, without any indication of what teaching in the references would show what was well known. This reasoning engages in hindsight

speculation that section 2143 and the Federal Circuit expressly proscribe: “the level of skill in the art cannot be relied upon to provide the suggestion to combine references,” (MPEP 2143, citing *Al-Site Corp. v. VSI Int’l Inc.*, 174 F.3d 1308 (Fed. Cir. 1999)).

It is noteworthy that section 2143 takes pains to make this point clear, elaborating that “a statement that modifications of the prior art to meet the claimed invention would have been ‘well within the ordinary skill of the art at the time the claimed invention was made’ because the references relied upon teach that all aspects of the claimed invention were individually known in the art is not sufficient to establish a prima facie case of obviousness with some objective reason to combine the teachings of the references.” (citing *Ex parte Levengood*, 28 USPQ2d 1300, Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1993). By repeating the mistakes criticized in section 2143 and failing to show a suggestion or motivation to combine the cited references, the rejection has failed to establish a prima facie case of obviousness under 35 USC 103.

Although Tran was not cited in connection with this limitation, Tran also does not mention clocks in any context, and only describes buffers as requiring larger transistors (col. 3 lines 15-17).

Page 2 of the Office action states that Faue teaches that two inverters can be used to form an internal clock buffer, citing col. 3 lines 4-5. However, even Faue does not disclose or suggest the use of different sized transistors with smaller transistors used as internal clock buffers. Nor does Faue disclose or suggest anything that would make up for the missing elements in Sato and Tran.

In summary, none of the references disclose or suggest the use of smaller transistors as internal clock buffers. Two of the references (Sato, Tran) specifically teach against this practice, while the third reference (Faue) never mentions the use of different sizes of transistors for any purpose.

In addition to the above, independent claims 1 and 21 have been amended to claim interconnects that actually connect the indicated transistors, rather than just having the capability of doing so.

The remaining pending claims depend from claims 1 and 21, and therefore contain the same limitations not disclosed or suggested in the cited references.

Minor changes have also been made to some claims to avoid possible antecedent issues (e.g., reversing the use of the words 'a' and 'the'). These changes have no substantive effect on the scope of the claims and are not made for the purpose of patentability.

**CONCLUSION**

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that the application is now in condition for allowance, and indication of allowance by the Examiner is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions concerning this application, he or she is requested to telephone the undersigned at the telephone number shown below as soon as possible. If any fee insufficiency or overpayment is found, please charge any insufficiency or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 12-3-03

John Travis

John Travis  
Intel Corporation  
Reg. No. 43,203

Attorney phone:

(512) 314-0334

Correspondence address:

Blakely Sokoloff Taylor & Zafman LLP  
12400 Wilshire Blvd  
Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, California 90025-1026

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail with sufficient postage in an envelope addressed to Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313 on:

12/3/03

Date of Deposit

Annie Pearson

Name of Person Mailing Correspondence

Annie Pearson

Signature

12/3/03

Date